



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,840	12/01/2000	Johnatan Bacon	9463-014-999	4238

20583 7590 04/16/2002

PENNIE AND EDMONDS
1155 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 100362711

EXAMINER

JOYNES, ROBERT M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1615

DATE MAILED: 04/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/728,840

Applicant(s)

BACON ET AL.

Examiner

Robert M. Joynes

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of applicants' Amendment filed on February 1, 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 3-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baichwal et al. (WO 95/28916). Baichwal teaches a sustained release composition comprising an active agent and excipients (Page 2, lines 5-24). The excipient matrix may include one or more heteropolysaccharide, preferably xanthan gum (Page 4, lines 27-35), a cross-linking agent (Page 5, line 19 – Page 6, line 3), hydrophobic material such as zein (Page 7, lines 18-32) and an active agent. The hydrophobic material may be present in the composition in amounts from about 1% to about 20% by weight of the final formulation (Page 8, lines 1-10). The active agent may be an antihistamine, analgesic, anti-inflammatory agent, anti-epileptic agent, anti-emetics agent, vasodilator, anti-tussive agent, anti-asthmatic agent, anti-spasmodic, hormone, diuretic, anti-hypotensive agent, antibiotic and others (Page 12, line 17 – Page 13, line 7). The composition may further contain an inert pharmaceutical diluent such as a starch (Page 17, Claim 1).

Art Unit: 1615

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baichwal. The teachings of Baichwal are discussed above.

Baichwal does not expressly teach the exact range of gelling agents recited in instant Claim 2. The reference also does not teach every active agent or gelling agent or prolamin recited in the instant claims.

While the reference does not teach the complete concentration range, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to prepare a sustained-release formulation with an excipient matrix comprising a prolamin, one or more gelling agents, one or more additional excipients and an active agent. It is within the skill of the art to vary the ingredient (the prolamin, gelling agents, active agents and additional excipients) to achieve the same expected result.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to produce a composition that releases the active agent over an extended period of time.

Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 1, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the cited reference does not teach the same ratio of gelling agents to the prolamins. Specifically, applicants point out at Page 4 of their Response that the gum is present from about 15% to about 30% and the hydrophobic material is present from about 1% to about 20% by weight.

If one were to practice the invention of the cited reference, one could have 15% of the gum and 20% of hydrophobic material (zein). If the total weight of the composition was 100 grams, 15 grams would be gum and 20 grams would be hydrophobic material. The total weight of the gum and the hydrophobic material would be 35 grams. The gum would be present in about 43% of the total weight of the gum and the hydrophobic material, which falls within the range claimed in the present application. In addition, the hydrophobic material in that case would be present in the composition in a higher percentage.

Therefore, the cited reference anticipated and/or renders obvious the instant claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Joynes whose telephone number is (703) 308-8869. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on (703) 308-2927. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Art Unit: 1615

305-3592 for regular communications and (703) 305-3592 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Robert M. Joynes
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1615
April 11, 2002

THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600